



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

“MAN BY MAN,” JOSHUA 7, 17

BY MAX L. MARGOLIS, Dropsie College

IN his Lectures on “The Polity of the Ancient Hebrews” (*JQR.*, New Series, III, 1 ff.) Judge Sulzberger has occasion to cite the “classical text” in Josh. 7, 16-18 bearing on the subject of the Israelite army organization and, after giving his own version, aptly remarks: “The text is slightly defective, but a careful reading of it justifies this translation.”

The text in question is indeed faulty. The two English Versions (Authorized, Revised) reproduce the Hebrew text as commonly printed. As the differences between the two Versions are only verbal we may transcribe here the Revised. “(16) So Joshua rose up early in the morning, and brought Israel near by their tribes; and the tribe of Judah was taken: (17) and he brought near the family of Judah; and he took the family of the Zerahites: and he brought near the family of the Zerahites man by man; and Zabdi was taken: (18) and he brought near his household man by man; and Achan, the son of Carmi, the son of Zabdi, the son of Zerah, of the tribe of Judah, was taken.”

One need only turn to verse 14 to realize the two points wherein the received text is at fault. Verse 14 reads in the Revised Version (which again differs only verbally from the Authorized): “In the morning therefore

ye shall be brought near by your tribes: and it shall be, that the tribe which the Lord taketh shall come near by families; and the family which the Lord taketh shall come near by households; and the household which the Lord shall take shall come near man by man." Accordingly, the divisions are: the tribe (שבט), the family (משפחה), the household (בית), the man (גבר). We should therefore expect verse 17 to have read: "And he brought near the tribe of Judah by families; and he took the family of the Zerahites: and he brought near the family of the Zerahites household by household; and Zabdi was taken." Such, in substance, is the version accepted by the learned Judge, and he is sustained by modern commentators.

When we approach the Hebrew of verse 17, the substitution of לְבָתִּים (household by household) for לְגַבְרִים (man by man) is a self-evident remedy. As for the beginning of the verse, all that is required is a change in the pointing of the first משפחה: in the received text it is pointed מִשְׁפַּחַת (family, in the singular), but we should point the word מִשְׁפָּחוֹת (families, in the plural). Accordingly, what the author intended was: "And he brought near the families of Judah"—which is indeed an abbreviated expression for the phraseology postulated on the basis of verse 14: "And he brought near the tribe of Judah by families."

The two forms of the text, the received and the emended, may now be placed in juxtaposition:

Received Text	Emended Text
וַיִּשְׁכֶּם יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּבָקָר וַיִּקְרַב אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל ¹⁶	
לְשִׁבְטָיו וּלְכָד שִׁבְט יְהוּדָה ^{17a} וַיִּקְרַב	
אֶת מִשְׁפַּחַת יְהוּדָה וּלְכָד אֶת	אֶת מִשְׁפָּחוֹת יְהוּדָה וּלְכָד אֶת
מִשְׁפַּחַת הַזֹּרְחִי ^{17b} וַיִּקְרַב אֶת	

משפחת הזרחי לגברים

משפחת הזרחי לבתים

וילכד זכרי ¹⁸ ויקרב את ביתו

לגברים וילכד עכן בן כרמי

בן זכרי בן זרח למטה יהודה

The Emended Text is printed as above by Bennett in Haupt's Bible (1895). In his Notes (page 26) we read: "משפחת, with some MSS. and Ⲅ (Septuagint) Ⲛ (Vulgate); לבתים, with Ⲛ (Vulgate) Ⲅ (Peshitta) and some MSS., Dillm(ann), &c." He also remarks: "Ⲅ (Septuagint) ^ (omits) 17b and את ביתו in 18; which Hollenberg (*Progr.* 13) is inclined to follow."

As will be noted, the authority of the Septuagint is adduced for the first change (משפחת), but not for the second (לבתים), obviously because, with Hollenberg, he finds verse 17b to have been wanting in the Septuagint, though he is not ready to follow Hollenberg in the assumption that the second half of verse 17 is a late addition in our Hebrew text which should be excised. Driver in Kittel's Bible (second edition, 1909) at least notes that ten manuscripts of the Greek read "by households"; but that is still far from saying what the original Greek translator read and wrote.

The aim of the present paper is to show that the verse-half in question was present in the Septuagint and that furthermore the translator read in his Hebrew text לבתים.

But before the argument is presented in substantiation of my double contention it may be well to ascertain upon what authority the Received Text rests or who are its witnesses.

Both Baer and Ginsburg print the two obvious errors: **לגברים** and **משפחת**. Baer has nothing to say on the former; with regard to the latter he remarks: "The Soncino edition prints faultily **לבתי**." The Soncino edition of the Prophets (1485-1486) is the first print of that part of the Scriptures. According to Ginsburg, the second print of the Prophets in the first print of the entire Bible (Soncino 1488) has likewise **לבתי**. The other books (**ספרים אחרים**) which, according to Ginsburg, read **משפחת** and **לבתי** are certain manuscripts enumerated by Kennicott and De-Rossi.¹ De-Rossi adds that "by households" is found not only in the Vulgate and the Syriac Peshitta, but also in the Aldine edition of the Septuagint, on the authority of Fischer, *Prolus. de versionibus Graecis* 8, Leipzig 1772, page 156, who favors this reading, though Masius accepts the current reading "man by man." I have Fischer before me; he adds that the reading is apparently supported by verse 14.

When prints and manuscripts differ, recourse must be had to (a) Masoretic evidence and (b) the testimony of the Jewish mediæval commentators.

According to the Masorah on Num. 3, 23,² four instances of **משפחת** (singular) occur in Leviticus and Joshua (or Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Joshua), to wit: Levit. 25, 47 and the three in Josh. 7, 17. Hence the pointing **משפחת** at the head of verse 17 is recognized by the Masorah and the reading **משפחות** must be pronounced contrary to the

¹ **משפחות**, so with vowel letter indicating the plural, Kenn. 182, 250; 548 and 598 in the margin; 155 first hand, i. e. under the subsequent correction; **לבתי** 253, 257, 260, 524, 583 margo, 366 over an erasure, **לגברים** —both readings together—531; De-Rossi 305 first hand, 20, 174, 663 over an erasure, 716 in the margin.

² See Ginsburg, *The Massorah*, letter **נ**, No. 846, compare also No. 847a.

Masorah.—A list in Ginsburg, letter ל, No. 14, consists of words beginning in ל each of which is found only once in Scripture (דרישהו ל וכל חר וחר לית דכותהו); among them figures לְבָתִּים of Josh. 7, 14. Hence the reading לְבָתִּים in verse 17 is ruled out by the Masorah and לְגַבְרִים there is substantiated as Masoretic.

As for the Jewish commentators, Kimḥi's exposition makes it plain that he read מְשַׁפָּחַת and לְגַבְרִים. According to him, "the family of Judah" is the same as "the tribe of Judah"; supply לְמִשְׁפָּחוֹת "by families." The first לְגַבְרִים he paraphrases by לְאִנְשֵׁי רֹאשֵׁי בְתֵי הַמִּשְׁפָּחָה "man by man who is the head of a household," while the second גַּבְרִים means הַבֵּית אִנְשֵׁי the individual members of the household.

But we have earlier evidence for the reading לְגַבְרִים in verse 17. In the first place the Targum has it (לְגַבְרִיא; the Targum also pointed the first מְשַׁפָּחַת in the singular, וְזָרְעִית, Praetorius, *Das Targum zu Josua*, 1899). But we may ascend still higher. We find it in the Septuagint recension of Origen which dates from the middle of the third century of our era.

Origen's recension with its critical signs³ is extant in the Syriac translation of Paul of Tella (616-7). It was published by Lagarde (1892) from a British Museum manuscript and the critical signs where faultily placed or entirely wanting were restored from the commentary of Masius⁴ who had before him another manuscript which has since disappeared.

³ A plus found in the Hebrew but wanting in the Greek text which was subjected to revision was introduced by an asterisk, *, and closed by a metobelus, : or ↓.

⁴ Andrew Du Maes, died 1573. His work on Joshua appeared in 1574; it is excerpted in the second volume of the *Critici Sacri*.

The Syriac text of verses 17 and 18 reads as follows (to obviate typographical difficulties it is given in Hebrew type) : >ואתקרב * יהודא ↓ ואתחוי טוהמא דורח > ואתקרב : (to obviate typographical difficulties it is given in Hebrew type) : >ואתקרב * יהודא ↓ ואתחוי זכרי ואתקרב ביתא דילה נברא טוהמא דורח < נברא * יהודא * ואתחוי עכר ברה דכרמי ברה דזכרי ברה דורח * מן שרבתא ↓ דיהודא.

The words enclosed within < > are missing in the manuscript (and are omitted by Lagarde). Whether the omission occurred at some stage in the Syriac transmission of the text or was present in the Greek archetype upon which the translation was based is immaterial. It is simply a case of aberration of the scribe's eye from the first דורח (or its Greek equivalent) to the second (homoioteleuton).

The Greek for the Syriac as given above is extant in the manuscripts underlying Lagarde's edition of the Greek Old Testament (1883; one of those manuscripts served as the basis of the first printed edition of the Septuagint in the Complutensian Polyglot). There is a gap right at the start the nature of which escaped Lagarde. He prints in brackets *και προσηχθη κατα δημοις*. But one more word should be added; *ιουδα*. The scribe's eye wandered from *ιουδα* with which verse 16 closes to *ιουδα* of verse 17. Hence the full text reads: <*και προσηχθη κατα δημοις ιουδα*> *και ανεδειχθη δημοις ο ζαραει και προσηχθη δημοις ο ζαραει κατα ανδρα και ανεδειχθη ζαβδει και προσηχθη ο οικος αυτου κατα ανδρα και ανεδειχθη αχαρ υιος χαρμει υιον ζαβδει υιον ζαρα της φυλης ιουδα*.

As will be observed, the critical signs are missing. The two texts supply each other's deficiencies admirably. Origen accordingly wrote: *και προσηχθη κατα δημοις * ιουδα: και ανεδειχθη δημοις ο ζαραει και προσηχθη δημοις ο ζαραει κατα ανδρα(ς) * και*

ανεδειχθη ζαβδει και προσηχθη ο οικος αυτου κατα ανδρα: και ανεδειχθη
αχαρ υιος χαρμει υιον ζαβδει υιον ζαρα * της φυλης ιουδα:

It is obvious that Origen read in his Hebrew of verse 17 לַגְּבִירִים κατα ανδρα(ς), comp. לַגְּבִירִים κατα ανδρα verse 18.

The error in the Hebrew is as old as Origen.

We may take it for granted that all such manuscripts of the Septuagint as exhibit the reading κατα ανδρα(ς) in verse 17 were influenced by Origen's recension.

Two such manuscripts are F (Ambrosianus) and n (a Mount Athos manuscript hitherto uncollated of which photographs have been secured by the Dropsie College. It is related to some twelve manuscripts grouping around the *Catena Nicephori*, but has readings of its own). They diverge at the end, but otherwise present a text substantially identical: F n και προσηχθη κατα δημους ιουδα και ενεδειχθη δημοις ο ζαραι (F reads ζαραι) και προσηχθη δημοις ο ζαραι κατ(α) ανδρας * και ενεδειχθη ο (omitted in F) οικος ζαμβρι και προσηχθη ο οικος (F adds αυτον) κατ(α) ανδρα(ς) * και ενεδειχθη αχαρ

÷
n υιος ζαμβρι υιον ζαρα ο του χαρμι υιον αυτου

F ο υιος χαρμει υιον ζαμβρει υιον ζαρα

F n της φυλης ιουδα.

Opposite the portion which is enclosed above between two upper points there is found on the margin of n an asterisk (*). To the sign ÷ over ζαμβρι corresponds in the same manuscript on the margin χαρμι by the first hand.

Both texts have Origen's additions. Both have the telltale κατ(α) ανδρας in verse 17. Both however, write ζαμβρι in the place of ζαβδει. In this they revert to the form of the name in the Greek text antedating Origen, which form goes back to a Hebrew variant זמרי for the received זמרי. In I Chron. 2, 6 Zimri is the first-born of Zerah, the

son of Judah. As for the divergence at the end, F, barring the form *ζαμβρι*, coincides with Origen, while n text (not: margin) in common with its group members curtails the pedigree by one and then adds by way of rectification that the culprit was not really the son of Zimri, but his son Carmi's son. We shall meet below in one other manuscript belonging to a different group with the same ending.

The Origen recension underlies furthermore the uncials A (Alexandrinus) and its recently discovered congener θ (Washington Codex). Of the two A is intact, while the scribe of θ (or a predecessor of his) made an omission by homoioteleuton exactly at the place where the scribe of the Syriac has erred. Restore θ as follows:

και προσηχθη κατα δημους και ενεδειχθη δημοσ ο ζαραι <και προσηχθη δημοσ ο ζαραι> κατ ανδρας και ενεδειχθη αχαρ υιος ζαμβρι υιον ζαρα with which compare A: και προσηχθη κατα δημους και ενεδειχθη δημοσ ο ζαριει και προσηχθη δημοσ ο ζαριει κατ ανδρας και ενεδειχθη αχᾱ (i. e. αχαν) υιος ζαμβρι υιον ζαρα.

The differences are trifling (note *αχαν* in A = עכן as in our Hebrew text; the Septuagint writes *αχαρ* = עכר, comp. I Chron. 2, 7). Both have the curtailed pedigree at the end but without the postscript which we find in n.

The manner in which the text of the two uncials was constructed is plain. It is an eclectic text. A pre-Origen text was followed in the ending (note the curtailed pedigree and the form *Zambri*); otherwise a transcript was made of Origen's revised text, omitting the additions marked by an asterisk but retaining a plus where Origen failed to mark it by signs (perhaps the signs were missing in the copy immediately before the scribe which may have been itself a transcript of Origen's text).

On the basis of the present case it might be argued that A^o constitute the text which Origen made the basis of his revision. Hence the second *δημος ο ζαραει* was unmarked from the start, since it was found in that text. But when all the evidence derived from a critical study of A^o throughout the book of Joshua is brought to bear upon the problem the inference is unavoidable that the two uncials have made use of Origen and not the reverse. Naturally A^o retained Origen's *κατ ανδρας* in verse 17.

The text which Origen made the basis of his revision is none other than the famous Vaticanus (B) or a text closely related to it. Verses 16-18 read in B: *και ωρθρισεν ιησους και προσηγαγεν τον λαον κατα φυλας και ενεδειχθη η φυλη ιουδα και προσηχθη κατα δημοις και ενεδειχθη δημος ζαραει και προσηχθη κατ ανδρα και ενεδειχθη αχαρ υιος ζαμβρει υιον ζαρα.*

Origen, in dealing with this text, proceeded upon the assumption that *κατα ανδρα* goes with what immediately precedes it and covers *לנברים* in verse 17. and that the translator omitted *וילכר זכרי ויקרב את ביתו לנברים*. He accordingly filled up the gap just as he made good the other omissions. As was his wont, he did not translate the Hebrew afresh, but made use for the parts missing of one or all of the three later Greek translators (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) dating from the middle of the second post-Christian century. In all such cases he transcribed them faithfully without regard to the disharmony thus produced by welding together incongruous versions. The incongruity in the present case will become manifest as this investigation proceeds.

It is, however, possible that Origen recognized that the gap occurred before and not after *κατα ανδρα*. In placing the signs, Lagarde relied too confidently on Masius; it is not

always easy to tell whether the latter did not handle the signs of his Syriac manuscript with considerable freedom and here and there operated with conjecture. The British Museum manuscript errs when it places the asterisk too far down, but, I believe, is altogether right in putting the metobelus after *αυτου*. Accordingly, the asterisk should be moved up, against Masius, in front of *κατα ανδρα(ς)*. The Syriac certainly read *κατα ανδρας* in the plural; the reading is substantiated by AF ϕ n. It is true, F reads the plural also below; but n has correctly the singular in agreement with B. In verse 14 all, with exception of nsz, have the singular. It would seem, therefore, that the singular accords with the style of the original Septuagint, while the plural which is a bit more literal squares with the manner of the source from which Origen supplied the omission. If this be so, the error *לגברים* in verse 17 is shown to be as old as the times of Akiba in which period the three principal Greek translators after the Septuagint flourished. Origen's text in verses 17 and 18 will then have read as follows: *και προσηχθη κατα δημονς * ιουδα: και ανεδειχθη δημος ο ζαραει και προσηχθη δημος ο ζαραει * κατα ανδρας και ανεδειχθη ζαβδει και προσηχθη ο οικος αυτου: κατα ανδρα και ανεδειχθη αχαρ νιος χαρμει νιον ζαβδει νιον ζαρα * της φυλης ιουδα:*

But even as corrected Origen's text rests upon a mechanical procedure. In saying this, we are not finding fault with Origen. His aim was to square the Greek with the Hebrew as he found it, the "Hebrew truth." But our task is a different one. If B, the text underlying Origen's revision, is faulty, and we are in accord with the Church Father on that score, it becomes our business to correct it. We are in a position to correct it by consulting other texts which are its congeners and by a careful study of the

manner of translation which was adopted by the author of the oldest Greek version of our book.

We are in a position to confront B with three texts which normally go with it. They are all more or less impure, contaminated with matter borrowed from Origen's revision. But the basis is a text very much like B. Into it they work Origenic additions, but in a manner of their own. The three texts are h (55 in Holmes-Parsons), the Ethiopic translation (codices FH), and the Coptic version recently published by Thompson.

Of the three, h is a mutilated text, the scribe having been guilty of two omissions due to homoioteleuton. I supply the gaps within \diamond . h και προσηχθη κατα δημους και ενεδειχθη δημος ο ζαραι <και προσηχθη δημος ο ζαραι> κατ οικους· ανεδειχθη οικος ζαμβρι <και προσηχθη οικος ζαμβρι κατα ανδρα και ανεδειχθη αχαρ^ε νιος χαρμι νιον ζαμβρι>.

Deplorable as the omissions are, the significant κατ οικους is intact. (In front of ενεδειχθη the conjunction και may have also dropped out.)

The Greek underlying the Coptic (Θ) and Ethiopic (Ϝ) read: και προσηχθη κατα δημους ιονδα και ενεδειχθη δημος (ο) ζαραει (ζαρι Ϝ) και προσηχθη δημος ο ζαραει (ζαρι Ϝ) κατ οικους και ενεδειχθη οικος ζαμβρι και προσηχθη οικος ζαμβρι κατα ανδρα και ενεδειχθη αχαρ (αχαν Ϝ) νιος χαμρι νιον ζαρα (+της φυλης ιονδα Ϝ).

Both contain the reading κατ οικους.

Now at last it becomes an easy matter to restore the archetype of B. It read in verses 16-18 as follows: ¹⁶ και ωρθρισεν ιησους και προσηγαγεν τον λαον κατα φυλας και ενεδειχθη η φυλη ιονδα ¹⁷ και προσηχθη κατα δημους και ενεδειχθη δημος ζαραει και προσηχθη <κατ οικους και ενεδειχθη οικος ζαμβρι ¹⁸ και προσηχθη> κατα ανδρα και ενεδειχθη αχαρ νιος ζαμβρει νιον ζαρα.

The omission, it is clearly seen, was due to homoioteleuton. The archetype of B which in this case as in many others may be identified with the original text of the Septuagint had the portion now missing and in the form given above, as shown by the related texts h **UE**. For all three (in h, as we have seen, the last two words dropped out along with what follows) have the portion, and they could not have derived it from Origen, who, as was shown above, wrote *κατ ανδρας* for *κατ οικους* and *ο οικος αυτου* for *οικος ζαμβρι*, both in conformity with the received Hebrew text.

Internal evidence serves to corroborate my conclusions based upon the external evidence of correct grouping. The translator had before him verses 16-18 in somewhat the following form (to facilitate an understanding of my remarks below, I reproduce in the parallel column the Greek as restored) :

וַיִּשְׁכֶּם יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּבֹקֶר וַיִּקְרַב	¹⁶ και ωρθρισεν ιησους και προσηγαγεν
אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל לִשְׁבֹּטָיו וּלְכֹד	τον λαον κατα φυλας και ενεδειχθη η
שִׁבְט יְהוּדָה ¹⁷ וַיִּקְרַב אֶת מִשְׁפַּחַת	φυλη ιουδα ¹⁷ και προσηχθη κατα
יְהוּדָה וּלְכֹד אֶת מִשְׁפַּחַת הַזֹּרְחִי	δημους και ενεδειχθη δημοσ ζαραει
וַיִּקְרַב אֶת מִשְׁפַּחַת הַזֹּרְחִי לְבָתִּים	και προσηχθη κατ οικους και
וּלְכֹד בֵּית זִמְרִי ⁸¹ וַיִּקְרַב	ενεδειχθη οικος ζαμβρι ¹⁸ και προ-
אֶת בֵּית זִמְרִי לַגִּבּוֹרִים	σηχθη κατα ανδρα και ενεδειχθη
וּלְכֹד עֹבֵר בֶּן זִמְרִי בֶן זֹרַח	αχαρ υιος ζαμβρι υιον ζαρα

The translator's fondness for condensation reveals itself at the start. *וַיִּשְׁכֶּם בְּבֹקֶר* is simply *και ωρθρισεν* "rose up early" (Origen added *το πρωι* "in the morning"). While he uses the active voice (*προσηγαγεν*) for the first *וַיִּקְרַב* (verse 16), he proceeds in the sequel with the passive construction (*προσηχθη*, "was brought near"). By doing this he succeeds in getting rid of what to him seemed unnecessary repetition

though such is quite in accordance with the style of Hebrew writing. He reproduces the subject as in the Hebrew with each new sub-division introduced by the verb "was taken"; he leaves it to be supplied from the context when the sub-division "taken" is "brought near" for another sub-division. Hence beginning with verse 16b he writes: "and the tribe of Judah was taken; and it was brought near *deme* by *deme*; and the *deme* of the Zarahites was taken: and it was brought near household by household; and the household Zamri was taken: and it was brought near man by man; and Achar, ec., was taken." It was left for subsequent texts (h **UE**) to introduce the explicit subject. That this is not to be laid at the door of the translator is clear from the nature of the omission in B. For with h **UE** as a basis, the textual form after the omission (aberration of the scribe's eye from the second *προσηχθη* to the third) would have resulted in *και προσηχθη οικος ζαμβρι κατα ανδρα*. The omission of *οικος ζαμβρι* in front of *κατα ανδρα* in B proves my contention as to the translator's method of condensation.

The translator pointed the first *משפחת* in verse 17 as a plural (*משפחות*). In accordance with his method of condensation, the clause "and he brought near the *demes* of Judah" became "and it (sc. the tribe of Judah) was brought near by *demes*."

The other variations between the Hebrew underlying the Septuagint and our received Hebrew text need not detain us. Of utmost importance is the reading *לבתים* in verse 17. As for the omission of Carmi at the end, the curtailment may and may not have been found in the Hebrew. Achan's father was omitted because he was of no moment, each warrior, N. N. son of N. N., ranging himself immediately under the household (*בית*) which comprised a num-

ber of families in the modern sense of the word. Mez (*Die Bibel des Josephus*, 1895, 5 f.) is wrong in arguing that Carmi is an interloper; the Septuagint certainly read בן כרמי in verse 1. Josephus with his ἀγαρὸς ... ξεβεδαιὸν παῖς (*Ant.* V 33) merely condensed the pedigree. In § 43 where he gives the execution of the divine order we meet with the fourfold order: φιλῆη (שבט), φρατρία (משפחה), συγγενεῖα (בית), ἀνὴρ (נבר). Though he may have written with a view to verse 14, we shall not go amiss in saying that Josephus, if he had the Septuagint open before him, read κατ' οἴκους, and, if he worked with the Hebrew text before him, he found in verse 17 לְבָתִּים.

The error in the Hebrew accordingly crept in between the times of Josephus and the times of Akiba.

I will now adduce further proof for the correctness of my restoration of the archetype of B from still another quarter. A recension which is not Origen's but which a recent writer (Hautsch, *Der Lukiantext des Oktateuch*, 1910) would stamp as that of the martyr Lucian (died 311 or 312) is found in a group of manuscripts enumerated by me in the article "The K Text of Joshua" (*AJSL.*, XXVIII (1911), 1 ff.). In the present state of our knowledge it is perhaps best to forego identifying it with any one of the three recensions signalized by Jerome and to speak of it as a nameless recension (see the lucid discussion by Professor G. F. Moore, in *AJSL.*, XXIX (1912), 37 ff.). Be that as it may, the manuscripts constituting that recension divide themselves in two sub-groups, a larger and a smaller. The former which is not a pure text, contaminated as it is with Origenic matter, is nevertheless useful as a means for correcting the errors of the smaller group. The larger sub-group may itself be subdivided into a larger

group of four (u = 84, l = 134; p = 76; t = 74; u = ulpt) and a smaller group of three (f = 106; i = Cod. Gr. 609 of the Paris National Library; z = 44; f = fiz). z departs in verses 16-18 considerably from its congeners (fi) and must be studied separately. It reads: *και ωρθρισεν ιησους το πρωι και προσηγαγε τον λαον κατα φυλας και ανεδειχθη η φυλη ιουδα και προσηχθη κατα δημους και ανεδειχθη ο ζαραι δημος και προσηχθη δημος ο ζαραι κατ ανδρας και ανεδειχθη αχαρ υιος ζαμβρι υιον ζαρα ο του χαρμι υιον αυτου.*

The text is mutilated; but the omission is not to be put to the account of the scribe who appears to have transcribed a mutilated text. For, barring the end (it shares the postscript of n, see above), he gives a text in verses 17 and 18 substantially agreeing with Aθ. z accordingly steps out for our present purposes as a representative of its narrower or wider group. If we compare the text of i—it reads

και ωρθρισεν ιησους το πρωι και προσηγαγε τον λαον αυτου κατα φυλας αυτου και ανεδειχθη η φυλη ιουδα και προσηχθησαν κατα δημους ιουδα και ανεδειχθη δημος ο ζαρα και προσηγαγον τον δημον τον ζαρα κατ οικους και ανεδειχθη οικος ζαμβρι υιον ζαρα της φυλης ιουδα—with that of f και ωρθρισεν ιησους το πρωι και προσηγαγε τον λαον κατα φυλας αυτου και ανεδειχθη η φυλη ιουδα και προσηχθησαν κατα δημους ιουδα και ανεδειχθη δημος ο ζαρα και προσηγαγον τον δημον ζαρα κατ οικους και ανεδειχθη οικος ζαμβρι και προσηγαγον τον οικον ζαμβρι κατ ανδρα και ανεδειχθη αχαρ υιος χαρμι υιον ζαμβρι υιον ζαρα της φυλης ιουδα

we discover an omission due to homoioteleuton in i, the scribe having wandered from ζαμβρι first to ζαμβρι third. f agrees in every respect (barring, of course, trifling variants) with u, their common text therefore representing one archetype. The latter ranges itself with its κατ οικους on the side of h **Ɑ**; it shares ιουδα (verse 16) with **Ɑ** and της φυλης ιουδα (end of verse 18) with **Ɑ**, both Origenic additions;

but it has a number of traits of its own; the plural *προσηχθησαν*, *ζαρα bis* (in the genitive), *και προσηγαγον* (active construction) *bis*. With F it has the full pedigree at the end.

As for the parallel group (R; the Old Latin of the Codex Lugdunensis (**I**) is an additional witness of this group), ro are practically identical. The text of verses 17 and 18 reads as follows: *και προσηνεχθησαν κατα δημους πατριων και ανεδειχθη δημοσ ο ζαρα και προσηγαγον τον δημον τον ζαρα κατα ανδρας και ενεδειχθη (ανεδειχθη ο) ο (omitted in ο) οικος ζαμβρι και ανεδειχθη αχαρ υιος χαρμι υιον ζαρα υιον ζαμβρι κατ οικους της φυλης ιουδα*. s has suffered an omission through homoioteleuton, the scribe wandering from *ανεδειχθη* second (as he read with ο for *ενεδειχθη* r) to *ανεδειχθη* third. The manuscript goes its own way with the reading *πατριας* for *δημους πατριων* ro and by cutting down the end so as to read *και ανεδειχθη αχαρ υιος χαρμι υιον ζαρα*. *προσηχθησαν* it shares with ufi.

The Greek underlying **I** read: *και προσηγαγον κατα δημους και ενεδειχθη δημοσ ο ζαρα και προσηγαγεν τον δημον τον ζαρα κατα ανδρας και ενεδειχθη ο οικος ζαμβρι και προσηχθη ο οικος κατα ανδρας και ενεδειχθη αχαρ υιος χαρμι υιον ζαμβρι υιον ζαρα*.

Disregarding unimportant variations, there remain to be singled out the transposition of *ζαρα* and *ζαμβρι* in the pedigree, the omission of *κατ οικους της φυλης ιουδα* which it shares with s, and the plus *και προσηχθη ο οικος κατ ανδρας* which it has in common with n comp. also **CE**. It is safe to say that the plus was introduced from another recension; **I** is therefore a mixed text. We must therefore fall back on ro as representatives of the sub-group **R****I**.

But ro require correction. The order *υιον ζαρα υιον ζαμβρι* is clearly impossible. Restore on the basis of **I** and ufi: *υιον ζαμβρι υιον ζαρα*. As neither Carmi (first in order) nor Zarah (last in order) was a household (*οικος*), it follows

that *κατ οικους* which was read neither by s nor by **℣** stands in the wrong place. It apparently entered the text from the margin; and it stood there opposite *κατα ανδρας* which is an old error common to **R℣** for *κατ οικους*. *κατα ανδρας* belongs at the head of verse 18 and in front thereof there had dropped out by homoioteleuton *και προσηγαγον τον οικον ζαμβρι*, comp. *υfi*.

Hence the archetype of **R℣** read: *και προσηνεχθησαν κατα δημους πατριων και ανεδειχθη δημοσ ο ζαρα και προσηγαγον τον δημον τον ζαρα <κατ οικους> και ανεδειχθη ο οικος ζαμβρι <και προσηγαγον τον οικον ζαμβρι κατα ανδρας> και ανεδειχθη αχαρ υιος χαρμι υιου <ζαμβρι> υιου <ζαρα> []*. I am somewhat in doubt as to whether *της φυλης ιονδα* which ro have at the end stood in the archetype. The points of similarity with the archetype of *υfi* are unmistakable. Both represent a revision of B and testify to the reading *κατ οικους* in verse 17. Interesting is the expression *δημους πατριων* (ro; for which s has simply *πατριας*). In the parallel text I Kingdoms 9, 21 Lagarde's Lucian renders *משפחה* by *πατρια* in the place of *φυλη* of the other texts, just as it writes *φυλη* for *בבש* in the place of *σκηπτρον* of the vulgar text.

It remains to be said that *κατ οικους* of the Aldina goes back to the text of the group 15. 18. 64. 128 which is of a mixed character, comp. the form *ζαβδει* for *ζαμβρι*.

By way of recapitulation, I subjoin in parallel columns (a) the reconstructed original Hebrew text; (b) the reconstructed original Septuagint; (c) the recension underlying **RUF℣**; (d) the recension of Origen; (e) the received Hebrew text.

<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>e</i>
וּיִקְרַב ¹⁷	¹⁷ και προσηχθη	¹⁷ και προσηχθησαν προσηγεχθησαν	¹⁷ και προσηχθη	וּיִקְרַב ¹⁷
אֶת מִשְׁפַּחַת	κατα δημους	κατα δημους πατ- ριων πατριας	κατα δημους	אֶת מִשְׁפַּחַת
יהודה			* ιουδα :	יהודה
וּלְכַד	και ενεδειχθη	και ανεδειχθη	και ανεδειχθη	וּלְכַד
אֶת מִשְׁפַּחַת	δημος	δημος	δημος	אֶת מִשְׁפַּחַת
הַזֹּרְחִי	ζαραει	ο ζαρα	ο ζαραει	הַזֹּרְחִי
וּיִקְרַב	και προσηχθη	και προσηγαγον	και προσηχθη	וּיִקְרַב
אֶת מִשְׁפַּחַת		τον δημουν	δημος	אֶת מִשְׁפַּחַת
הַזֹּרְחִי		τον ζαρα	ο ζαραει	הַזֹּרְחִי
לְנִבְרִים	<κατ οικους	κατ οικους	* κατα ανδρας	לְנִבְרִים
וּלְכַד	και ενεδειχθη	και ανεδειχθη	και ανεδειχθη	וּלְכַד
בֵּית זִמְרִי	οικος ζαμβρι	ο οικος ζαμβρι	ζαβδעי	זְבִירִי
וּיִקְרַב ¹⁸	¹⁸ και προσηχ- θη>	¹⁸ και προσηγαγον	¹⁸ και προσηχθη	וּיִקְרַב ¹⁸
אֶת בֵּית זִמְרִי		τον οικον ζαμβρι	ο οικος αυτου :	אֶת בֵּיתוֹ
לְנִבְרִים	κατα ανδρα	κατα ανδρας	κατα ανδρα	לְנִבְרִים
וּלְכַד	και ενεδειχθη	και ανεδειχθη	και ανεδειχθη	וּלְכַד
עֵכָר	αχαρ	αχαρ	αχαρ	עֵכָן
		υιος χαρμι	υιος χαρμει	בֶּן כְּרָמִי
בֶּן זִמְרִי	υιος ζαμβρι	υιον ζαμβρι	υιον ζαβδει	בֶּן זְבִירִי
בֶּן זֹרַח	υιον ζαρα	υιον ζαρα	υιον ζαρα	בֶּן זֹרַח
			* της φυλης	לְמִטָּה
			ιουδα :	יְהוּדָה